arXiv:1703.07946v1 [math.OC] 23 Mar 2017

Exact recursive updating of uncertainty sets for discrete-time plants with a lag

Robin Hill[1], Yousong Luo[2] *†

March 24, 2017

Abstract

In [9] there are new results concerning the polytopic set of possible states of a linear discrete-time SISO system subject to bounded disturbances from measurements corrupted by bounded noise. Using these results we construct an algorithm which, for the special case of a plant with a lag, recursively updates these polytopic sets when new measurements arrive. In an example we use the algorithm to investigate how the complexity of the polytopes changes with time.

1 INTRODUCTION

Determining the possible states of a dynamic system from noisy measurements, when the input and measurement errors are unknown except for bounds on their magnitude, is a computationally challenging task. We use the term *uncertainty set* to describe such a set of states consistent with past measurements and *a priori* assumptions on the exact plant model and bounds on the input and measurement noise.

The problem of determining uncertainty sets was formulated, and in principle solved, in the seminal papers [23], [18] and [4]. However, in real-time applications, for example fault detection and isolation [17], existing exact algorithms are of limited use because of their computational complexity. For this reason there has been a lot of research recently on the use of zonotopes and constrained zonotopes to approximate the exact polytopic uncertainty set, see for example [7], [2] and [19]. Recently, in [9], two Theorems have been presented from which new algorithms can be derived which update polytopic uncertainty sets exactly for linear, SISO, discrete-time plants. We believe that these algorithms run faster than any current exact schemes. The particular form that the new algorithms take depends on properties of the plant, and in this paper we present details for the important special case of plants with a lag. The Theorems quoted from [9] cover both cases, but the details of algorithm development for a plant with a lag are a lot simpler than the non-lag case treated in [9].

There is an extensive literature on the topic of uncertainty set propagation. See [8] and [14] for background, the survey paper [12] and the book [5]. Some of the many other papers which consider this problem are [6], [16], [21] and [22].

Exact, recursive methods currently require polytopic projection techniques, for example Fourier-Motzkin elimination, see [10], [15] and [20]. In these papers it is the identification of redundant inequality constraints that is most demanding computationally. The algorithm we present relies on updating the vertex-facet incidence matrix and does not generate any redundant constraints. Another advantage is that, along with the incidence matrix, both the vertices and facets of the uncertainty set are updated. Existing methods update either the facets or vertices, but not both. It is well known that converting from a representation of the polytope in terms of inequality constraints to a vertex representation is not easy, so having both at our disposal is valuable.

We give two examples of the algorithm in action. In the second we show how the uncertainty set evolves for a four dimensional plant.

2 Basic Setup

The material in the this Section and the next is a summary of results in [9], specialized to the case of a plant with no direct feedthrough. We have also made a notational change to the state space description in [9], with the input

*[1]Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Vic 3010, Australia robin.hill@unimelb.edu.au

†[2]School of Science, RMIT University, 124 Latrobe St, Melbourne, 3001, Australia yluo@rmit.edu.au

now affecting the future, not current, state. The plant P, a linear, time-invariant, causal discrete-time, m^{th} order scalar system, is assumed known. There are two sources of uncertainty, an input noise disturbance $(u_j)_{j=0}^{\infty} = \mathbf{u}$, and output measurement noise $(w_j)_{j=0}^{\infty} = \mathbf{w}$. The plant output is $(y_j)_{j=0}^{\infty} = \mathbf{y}$, and the measurement at time k is $z_k = y_k + w_k$. The initial state, at time $k = 0$, is assumed to be known exactly, but nothing is known about the uncertainties except that they satisfy $|u_j| \leq 1$ and $|w_j| \leq 1$.

Given an initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$, the measurement history $z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_k$, and the plant dynamics, we seek the uncertainty set at time $k+1$, denoted S_{k+1}; it is the set of possible states consistent with the measurements up to and including z_k, and is easily seen to be a closed, convex polytope.

2.1 Notation

Given a vector $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, y_1, \ldots)$ and any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $s < t$, we denote $(y_s, y_{s+1}, \ldots, y_t)$ by $y_{s:t}$. In matrix equations vectors are by default column vectors, so for example $y_{s:t}$ occuring in a matrix equation would be a column vector, and $y'_{s:t}$ is a row vector, where $'$ denotes transpose. The names of incidence vectors and matrices, whose components are zeros or ones, will start with the letter $\mathcal{I}$. The λ-transform (generating function) of an arbitrary sequence $\mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is defined to be $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\lambda) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} y_k \lambda^k$. Real Euclidean space of dimension m is denoted $\mathbb{R}^m$, where m is the order (McMillan degree) of the plant P. States of the plant P are represented by vectors, or points, in $\mathbb{R}^m$.

2.2 Transfer function description

The plant for the estimation system has the transfer function representation $P(\lambda) = \hat{\mathbf{n}}(\lambda)/\hat{\mathbf{d}}(\lambda)$ where

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}}(\lambda) = n_0 + n_1\lambda + n_2\lambda^2 + \cdots + n_m\lambda^m$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}(\lambda) = d_0 + d_1\lambda + d_2\lambda^2 + \cdots + d_m\lambda^m,$$

$m \geq 1$, $\hat{\mathbf{n}}(\lambda)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{d}}(\lambda)$ are coprime polynomials with real coefficients, and it is assumed that both the plant $P(\lambda)$ and the plant $P^*(\lambda)$ for the dual system, defined below, are causal, implying $d_0 \neq 0$ and $d_m \neq 0$. It is assumed that the plant has a lag so $n_0 = 0$, and without loss of generality we take $d_0 = 1$. It will also be assumed that $n_m \neq 0$ because this simplifies the description of the algorithm.

Assuming zero initial conditions, $\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{u}$ are related by $\hat{\mathbf{d}}(\lambda)\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\lambda) = \hat{\mathbf{n}}(\lambda)\hat{\mathbf{u}}(\lambda)$. The indeterminate λ represents the unit delay operator in the time domain.

2.3 State-space representations

A state-space description of the estimation system is

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = A\mathbf{x}_k + Bu_k \tag{1}$$
$$y_k = C\mathbf{x}_k \tag{2}$$
$$z_k = y_k + w_k$$

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{m-1} \\ -d_m & \ldots \; -d_1 \end{bmatrix}, \; B = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3a}$$
$$C = [n_m, \ldots, n_1]\,. \tag{3b}$$

In (3) $\mathbf{I}_{m-1}$ denotes the $m-1$ dimensional identity matrix, and $\mathbf{0}$ denotes a column vector of zeros of length $m-1$.

There is a system closely related to the estimation system that we refer to as the dual system. Its input and output sequences are $(y_j^*)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $(u_j^*)_{j=1}^{\infty}$, and the dual plant, denoted P^*, has the transfer function representation

$$P^*(\lambda) = -\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}(\lambda)}{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}(\lambda)} \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} = (n_m, \ldots, n_1, 0)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} = (d_m, \ldots, d_1, 1)$. A minimal state-space realization of the dual system is

$$\mathbf{x}^*_{k+1} = A^*\mathbf{x}^*_k + B^* y^*_k \tag{5}$$
$$u^*_k = C^*\mathbf{x}^*_k + D^* y^*_k \tag{6}$$

$$A^* = \begin{bmatrix} -d_{m-1}/d_m & \mathbf{I}_{m-1} \\ \vdots & \\ -1/d_m & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

$$B^* = \begin{bmatrix} n_{m-1} \\ \vdots \\ n_0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} d_{m-1} \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \frac{n_m}{d_m}, \tag{8}$$

$$C^* = \begin{bmatrix} -1/d_m & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ D^* = \frac{-n_m}{d_m}. \tag{9}$$

2.4 Polytopes

The primal and dual states defined in the previous Section will be interpreted in terms of the geometry of the polytopic uncertainty set S_k, so in this Section we introduce notation and briefly summarise the relevant theory of convex polytopes. For more information and background, including the definition of a polytope, see for example [11], [1] or [24]. Let S denote a closed, convex polytope.

The *support function* of S in $\mathbb{R}^m$ is

$$h_S(\mathbf{f}) = \max_{\mathbf{x}\in S} \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{x} \rangle ,$$

where $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

When $\mathbf{f} \neq \mathbf{0}$ the set

$$H_S(\mathbf{f}) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = h_S(\mathbf{f})\}$$

is the supporting hyperplane of S with direction (outer normal vector) $\mathbf{f}$. If $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0}$ then $H_S(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{R}^m$.

The intersection of S with a supporting hyperplane is called a *face* of S, and a face of dimension $m-1$ is a *facet* of S. A face of dimension $m-2$ is called a *ridge*, and the faces of dimensions 0 and 1 are termed *vertices* and *edges*, respectively. The sets of vertices and boundary points of S are denoted $\mathrm{vert}(S)$ and ∂S. The interior of S is denoted $\mathrm{int}\,(S)$, and the relative interior of a face F of S is denoted $\mathrm{relint}\,(F)$.

The *normal cone* at a boundary point $\mathbf{x}$ is the set

$$\{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = h_S(\mathbf{f})\}$$

and is denoted $\mathcal{N}_S(\mathbf{x})$. It is generated by the outward normals to the facets that form the polytope at $\mathbf{x}$, that is

$$\mathcal{N}_S(\mathbf{x}) = \{\lambda_1 \mathbf{f}_1 + \ldots + \lambda_n \mathbf{f}_n : \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \geq 0\},$$

where $\mathbf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{f}_n$ are the directions of the facets containing $\mathbf{x}$. Thus $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x})$ contains the directions of all hyperplanes which touch S at $\mathbf{x}$. If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{int}\,(S)$, then $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) := \{\mathbf{0}\}$. By definition the directions of facets, and of the hyperplanes that contain facets, point outwards from the polytope. A direction is a non-zero vector.

The dual state $\mathbf{x}^*_k(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{u}^*)$ can be interpreted as a direction vector $\mathbf{f}$ in the normal cone of the primal state $\mathbf{x}_k(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) \in S_k$. We shall sometimes drop the subscript k, and indicate the next time instant with the superscript $^+$. For example, $\mathbf{f}$ will denote $\mathbf{x}^*_k$, and $\mathbf{f}^+$ will denote $\mathbf{x}^*_{k+1}$. Likewise, states $\mathbf{x}$ and facets F belong to S_k, while $\mathbf{x}^+$ and F^+ belong to S_{k+1}.

2.4.1 Geometric and combinatorial description of S_k

Three matrices, $\mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ are used to describe the polytope S_k, and the algorithm updates all of them. Geometric data are contained in $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{F}$, while combinatorial information on the structure of S_k is contained in $\mathcal{I}$.

1. The vertices in S_k are ordered so that, for $\mathrm{vert}(S_k) = (\mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{n_v})$, there holds $C\mathbf{v}_{j_1} \geq C\mathbf{v}_{j_2}$ if $j_1 > j_2$. The ordering of ties is not important, but must be fixed. The m by n_v *vertex matrix* $\mathbf{V}$ has columns containing the coordinates of the vertices of S_k, ordered in the same way.

2. The m by n_f *facet matrix* $\mathbf{F}$ has columns containing the coordinates of the directions of the facets of S_k. Thus $\mathbf{F} = \left[\mathbf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{f}_{n_f}\right]$, where $\mathbf{f}_i$ is a column vector representing the direction of facet number i. The magnitude of $\mathbf{f}_i$ is not important, that is, for any $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha\mathbf{f}_i$ can be used in place of $\mathbf{f}_i$. The ordering of the facets is arbitrary but fixed, and the facet numbered i is denoted F_i.

3. The *vertex-facet incidence matrix* of S_k is the matrix $\mathcal{I} \in \{0,1\}^{n_f \times n_v}$ which has entry $\mathcal{I}(i,j) = 1$ if $\mathbf{v}_j \in F_i$, and $\mathcal{I}(i,j) = 0$ otherwise. So F_i is the convex hull of the vertices identified by the ones in the i^{th} row of $\mathcal{I}$.

Having completed the problem set up, we now show how to perform the first step of the algorithm, some preprocessing on S_k. The modification of S_k that this entails simplifies the next step, the computation of S_{k+1}.

2.4.2 Removing from S_k states inconsistent with the current measurement

Define two half planes in $\mathbb{R}^m$ associated with the left and right sides of Q.

Definition 1.

$$H^{\mathrm{W}+} = \{\mathbf{x} : C\mathbf{x} \geq z_k - 1\},$$
$$H^{\mathrm{E}-} = \{\mathbf{x} : C\mathbf{x} \leq z_k + 1\}.$$

If $\mathbf{x} \in \partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$ then points (y_k, u_k) on the left side of Q satisfy $y_k = C\mathbf{x}$, and if $\mathbf{x} \in \partial H^{\mathrm{E}-}$ then points (y_k, u_k) on the right side of Q satisfy $y_k = C\mathbf{x}$.

Those points $\mathbf{x} \in S_k$ for which $C\mathbf{x} \notin [-1 + z_k, 1 + z_k]$ have no successors, and are removed. We do this by replacing S_k with $S_k \cap H^{\mathrm{W}+} \cap H^{\mathrm{E}-}$. This effectively removes states inconsistent with the current measurement, z_k, from S_k. It can be shown that Theorems 6 and 7 remain valid when S_k is replaced by $S_k \cap H^{\mathrm{W}+} \cap H^{\mathrm{E}-}$.

Computing the intersection of polytopes with hyperplanes (or half spaces) is a well-known problem in computational geometry with an extensive literature. In the related problem of determining parameter bounds it has been treated in [13]. The best method to use depends on the available description of the polytope, and we are in the fortunate position of having at our disposal both geometric and combinatorial data. As this part of the algorithm treats a well-known computational task, we give only a brief description of how our code implements the step $S_k \leftarrow S_k \cap H^{\mathrm{W}+}$, intersection with $H^{\mathrm{E}-}$ being similar. In general vertices are both added and removed in this step, and in the next paragraph we describe how we determine the vertex set of $S_k \cap \partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$, which are the vertices that are added.

The vertices of $S_k \cap \partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$ are the points of intersection of the edges of S_k with the hyperplane $\partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$. To find the edges of S_k when $m < 5$ our code uses the fact that two vertices, $\mathbf{v}_{j_1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{j_2}$, are connected by an edge if and only if there are at least $m - 1$ different facets that contain them both. When $m \geq 5$ it must additionally be checked that no other vertex is contained in all the facets that contain $\mathbf{v}_{j_1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{j_2}$. In either case the edges of S_k can be found using $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathcal{I}$, see Chapter 2 of [24] for a discussion of the relevant theory. An edge of S_k will intersect $\partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$ if the two vertices joining the edge, $\mathbf{v}_{j_1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{j_2}$, satisfy $C\mathbf{v}_{j_1} < z_k - 1 < C\mathbf{v}_{j_2}$. Thus all edges of S_k which intersect $\partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$ can be efficiently found from $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathbf{V}$ and z_k. The points of intersection, $\mathbf{v}_i$, of edges of S_k with $\partial H^{\mathrm{W}+}$, which are the new vertices of $S_k \cap H^{\mathrm{W}+}$, are then determined by linear interpolation:

$$\mathbf{v}_i = \lambda\mathbf{v}_{j_1} + (1 - \lambda\mathbf{v}_{j_2})$$

where

$$\lambda = (1 - z_k - C\mathbf{v}_{j_2}) / C\,(\mathbf{v}_{j_1} - \mathbf{v}_{j_2})\,.$$

The facets of S_k that are not facets of $S_k \cap H^{\mathrm{W}+}$ are removed, and the final step is to update $\mathcal{I}$ by deleting those rows and columns corresponding to deleted facets and columns. Except for linear interpolation, all of this is done using Boolean operations.

3 Statement of Required Theorems

Following Witsenhausen, [23], S_{k+1} is given recursively in terms of S_k and the new observation z_k by

$$S_{k+1} = \left\{ \mathbf{x}^+ \;:\; \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x} \in S_k, \mathbf{x}^+ = A\mathbf{x} + Bu_k, \\ y_k = C\mathbf{x}, \\ |u_k| \leq 1, \;\; |y_k - z_k| \leq 1. \end{array} \right\} \tag{10}$$

Special terminology is now introduced to describe states $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}^+$ related as in (10).



Figure 1: The square Q.

Definition 2. *The state $\mathbf{x} \in S_k$ is said to be a precursor of the state $\mathbf{x}^+$, $\mathbf{x}$ is propagated to $\mathbf{x}^+$, and $\mathbf{x}^+$ is a successor to $\mathbf{x}$, if there exists a scalar u_k satisfying (1), (2), $|u_k| \leq 1$, and $|y_k - z_k| \leq 1$.*

So S_{k+1} is the set of all successors to all states in S_k, and any precursor of any state $\mathbf{x}^+ \in S_{k+1}$ is in S_k.

We now define a relation between the inputs and outputs of the primal and dual systems.

Definition 3. *The scalar pair (y_k, u_k) is said to be aligned with (y_k^*, u_k^*) if*

$$\begin{array}{c} u_k^* > 0 \implies u_k = 1 \\ u_k^* < 0 \implies u_k = -1 \\ |u_k| < 1 \implies u_k^* = 0 \end{array} \tag{11}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{c} y_k^* > 0 \implies y_k = 1 + z_k \\ y_k^* < 0 \implies y_k = -1 + z_k \\ |y_k - z_k| < 1 \implies y_k^* = 0. \end{array} \tag{12}$$

Visualisation of alignment is aided by defining a square in the $y_k u_k$-plane. The square Q contains points (y_k, u_k) satisfying $|u_k| \leq 1$ and $|y_k - z_k| \leq 1$, so Q contains the allowable outputs and inputs to the plant at time k. Thus Q is the set of points on or inside the square with corners $Q^{\mathrm{NE}} : (1 + z_k, 1), Q^{\mathrm{SE}} : (1 + z_k, -1), Q^{\mathrm{SW}} : (-1 + z_k, -1)$ and $Q^{\mathrm{NW}} : (-1 + z_k, 1)$. It has has sides of length two and is centred at $(z_k, 0)$. See Fig. 1.

Each point (y_k, u_k) belonging to the top (bottom) side of Q is aligned with every point on the positive (negative) u_k^* axis in the $y_k^* u_k^*$-plane. Similarly, each point (y_k, u_k) belonging to the right (left) side of Q is aligned with every point on the positive (negative) y_k^* axis in the $y_k^* u_k^*$-plane. The corner $Q^{\mathrm{NE}}(Q^{\mathrm{NW}}, Q^{\mathrm{SW}}, Q^{\mathrm{SE}})$ of Q is aligned with all points in the first (respectively, second, third, fourth) quadrant of the $y_k^* u_k^*$-plane. Finally, all points in Q are aligned with the origin in the $y_k^* u_k^*$-plane.

Associated with any $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ define in the $y_k^* u_k^*$-plane the dual line $L^*(\mathbf{f})$:

Definition 4. $L^*(\mathbf{f}) = \{(y_k^*, u_k^*) : n_m y_k^* + d_m u_k^* = -(\mathbf{f})_1\}$.

The scalars y_k^* and u_k^*, the input and output of the dual plant at time k, are constrained to lie on the line $L^*(\mathbf{f})$ by (6) and (9).

One more definition is required in order to state the Theorems quoted from [9].

Definition 5. *Given $\mathbf{x} \in S_k$, $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$ and z_k, the set $M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}, z_k)$ is the set of scalar pairs (u_k, y_k^*) which satisfy*

1. *$(y_k, u_k) \in Q$, where $y_k = C\mathbf{x}$ and*
2. *(y_k, u_k) is aligned with (y_k^*, u_k^*), where $(y_k^*, u_k^*) \in L^*(\mathbf{f})$.*

Finding M is computationally very simple, requiring merely the intersection of lines in the plane, and checking alignment. For example, in Fig. 2 alignment occurs solely between the two circled points, so M contains the singleton pair $(u_k, y_k^*) = (1, 0)$.

We now present the Theorems from which the algorithm is derived. See Fig. 3 for a geometric depiction of the vectors in Theorem 6 for the important special case where $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}^+$ are both boundary points. Proofs are in [9].



Figure 2: The circled points, at $(C\mathbf{x}, 1)$ in the $y_k u_k$ plane, and at the intersection of $L^*(\mathbf{f})$ and the u_k^* axis, are aligned, so $M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}, z_k) = \{(1, 0)\}$ because at the aligned points $u_k = 1$ and $y_k^* = 0$.



Figure 3: The vectors in Theorem 6. The state $\mathbf{x} \in \partial S_k$ and direction $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$ are propagated to $\mathbf{x}^+ \in \partial S_{k+1}$ and $\mathbf{f}^+ \in \mathcal{N}_{S_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x}^+)$ by the measurement z_k.

Theorem 6. *Suppose* $\mathbf{x} \in S_k$ *and* $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$. *Then* $\mathbf{x}^+ = A\mathbf{x} + Bu_k \in S_{k+1}$ *and* $\mathbf{f}^+ = A^*\mathbf{f} + B^* y_k^* \in \mathcal{N}_{S_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x}^+)$ *if and only if* $(u_k, y_k^*) \in M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}, z_k)$.

In a typical application a point on the boundary of S_k, and the direction of any one of its supporting hyperplanes, are propagated to a point on the boundary of S_{k+1} along with the direction of one of its supporting hyperplanes.

The companion result Theorem 7, given below, shows that any boundary point $\mathbf{x}^+ \in S_{k+1}$, and any direction in the normal cone of $\mathbf{x}^+$, are attainable from *any* precursor $\mathbf{x}$ of $\mathbf{x}^+$ and *some* direction in the normal cone of $\mathbf{x}$.

Theorem 7. *Select any* $\mathbf{x}^+ \in S_{k+1}$, *any* $\mathbf{f}^+ \in \mathcal{N}_{S_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x}^+)$ *and any precursor* $\mathbf{x}$ *of* $\mathbf{x}^+$. *There exists* $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$ *and* $(u_k, y_k^*) \in M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}, z_k)$ *for which* $\mathbf{x}^+ = A\mathbf{x} + Bu_k$ *and* $\mathbf{f}^+ = A^*\mathbf{f} + B^* y_k^*$.

In the rest of the paper we show how to use the propagation of states and their normal cones to update the uncertainty set for plants with a lag. An implementation of our algorithm in Matlab code, `uncertaintysetwithlag.m`, is available on the link below[1], which gives exact solutions for rational data. After sorting of the vertices and the removal of states inconsistent with the current measurement, it is only logical operations on incidence vectors and matrices that are needed to construct the updated incidence matrix, so the program can handle plants of a moderate size even when running exactly over rational data. The code can easily be modified to run using floating point calculations if required.

4 The incidence matrix for S_k

We turn now to the construction of $\mathcal{I}^+$, the incidence matrix for S_{k+1}, shown in Table 1, where the six incidence matrices in the body of the Table are defined in Section 5. Initially $\mathcal{I}^+$ is put equal to the $(3n_f + n_R)$ by $2n_v$ zero matrix, that is $\mathcal{I}^+$ is allocated sufficient space to accommodate all conceivable facets and vertices of S_{k+1}. So there are $3n_f + n_R$ rows in the Table, where n_f and n_R are respectively the number of facets and ridges in S_k. The rows are divided into fours block, each of the first three blocks comprising n_f rows, and the last block n_R rows. The

[1]Go to https://mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange

Facet directions \ Vertices	$g^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{V})$	$g^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbf{V})$
$A^*\mathbf{f}_i$(with $u_k = 1$)	$\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{T}}$	$\mathbf{0}$
$A^*\mathbf{f}_i$(with $u_k = -1$)	$\mathbf{0}$	$\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{B}}$
$A^*\mathbf{f}_i$(where $(\mathbf{f})_1 = 0$)	$\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{T}}$	$\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{B}}$
$A^*\mathbf{f}_l^R$(Facets of S_{k+1} from Ridges)	$\mathcal{I}R^{\mathrm{T}}$	$\mathcal{I}R^{\mathrm{B}}$

Table 1: The incidence matrix for S_{k+1} prior to the removal of rows and columns composed entirely of zeros

first two blocks point to facets of S_{k+1} whose directions have the property $(\mathbf{f})_1 \neq 0$, while the last two blocks point to facets whose directions $\mathbf{f}$ have the property $(\mathbf{f})_1 = 0$.

Turning now to the columns of Table 1, the first block of n_v columns points to states $A\mathbf{v}_j + B$, $\mathbf{v}_l \in \mathrm{vert}\big(S_k\big)$, which, depending on z_k, might be vertices of S_{k+1}. The second block of n_v columns points to states $A\mathbf{v}_j - B$, also possible vertices of S_{k+1}.

After $\mathcal{I}^+$ has been constructed in accordance with Table 1 it must have some rows and columns composed entirely of zeros. The final step is for these rows and columns of zeros to be deleted.

5 Filling in Table 1

We introduce notation to describe two ways a state can be propagated from S_k to S_{k+1}. The mappings g^{T} and g^{B}, where the superscripts indicate the top and bottom sides of Q, map a state on the boundary of S_k to the boundary of S_{k+1}.

On the top (bottom) side of Q, $u_k = 1$ ($u_k = -1$), and (1) is used to propagate $\mathbf{x}$.

Definition 8. *For any $\mathbf{x} \in S_k$ put*

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}) &= A\mathbf{x} + B \\ g^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbf{x}) &= A\mathbf{x} - B. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Definition 9. *A point $\mathbf{x} \in S_k$ is said to propagate up (resp. down) if $g^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x})$ $\big((g^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbf{x})\big)$ lies on the boundary of S_{k+1}.*

These propagations occur when the maximum or minimum allowable value of the input (± 1) is applied to the plant, and furthermore the resulting state of the plant lies on the boundary of S_{k+1}. Theorem 6 tells us, given $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$, if $\mathbf{x}$ propagates up or down. For example, in Fig. 2, if $\mathbf{x} \in \partial S_k$ then $\mathbf{x}$ propagates up to $g^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x})$ because there exists $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$ which implies $(u_k, y_k^*) = (1, 0) \in M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}, z_k)$ and so, by Theorem 6, $\mathbf{x}^+ = A\mathbf{x} + B \in S_{k+1}$ and $\mathbf{f}^+ = A^*\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{N}_{S_{k+1}}(\mathbf{x}^+)$ and is non-zero, further implying that $\mathbf{x}^+ \in \partial S_{k+1}$.

The significance of the maps in Definition 9 is made clear by the following Proposition. The proof is omitted.

Proposition 10. *Suppose $\mathbf{v}^+$ is a vertex of S_{k+1} with precursor $\mathbf{v}$. Then $\mathbf{v}^+$ must equal one of $g^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{v})$ or $g^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbf{v})$. Furthermore, if $S_k = S_k \cap H^{\mathrm{W}+} \cap H^{\mathrm{E}-}$, then $\mathbf{v}$ is a vertex of S_k.*

Definition 9 can be extended to facets as follows.

Definition 11. *Suppose F is a facet S_k, and F^+ is a facet S_{k+1}. Then F is said to propagate up (down) to F^+ if $F^+ = g^T(F)$, $\big(F^+ = g^B(F)\big)$.*

Here $g^{\mathrm{T}}(F)$, for example, denotes the set $\big\{g^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in F\big\}$.

If F propagates either up or down to F^+ then F^+ is an affinely isomorphic image of F because A is invertible. Let F_i be any facet of S_k, and denote its direction by $\mathbf{f}_i$. There are three possibilities:

1. The line $L^*\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)$ intersects the positive u_k^* axis, that is $d_m\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)_1 < 0$. The $n_f \times 1$ logical vector $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{T}}$ points to facets with such directions. Explicitly, $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{T}}(i) = 1$ if $\mathbf{f}_i$ satisfies $d_m\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)_1 < 0$, and $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{T}}(i) = 0$ otherwise;

2. $L^*\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)$ intersects the negative u_k^* axis, that is $d_m\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)_1 > 0$. Define $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{B}}(i) = 1$ if $\mathbf{f}_i$ satisfies $d_m\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)_1 > 0$, and $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{B}}(i) = 0$ otherwise; and

3. $L^*\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)$ passes through the origin. Define $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{O}}(i) = 1$ if $\mathbf{f}_i$ satisfies $\big(\mathbf{f}_i\big)_1 = 0$, and $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{O}}(i) = 0$ otherwise.

5.0.1 Case 1

For every $\mathbf{x}_j$ in F_i we have the situation depicted in Fig. 2. By Theorem 6, $\mathbf{x}_j$ is propagated up, and F_i is propagated up to the facet $F_i^+ := g^T\left(F_i\right)$ of S_{k+1}, which has direction $A^*\mathbf{f}_i$. The logical matrix $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{T}} \in \{0,1\}^{n_f \times n_v}$ is defined to have entry $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{T}}(i,j) = 1$ if $\mathcal{I}(i,j) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{T}}(i) = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{T}}(i,j) = 0$ otherwise. A one in the i^{th} row and j^{th} column of $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{T}}$ implies that there is a facet, F_i^+, of S_{k+1} with direction $A^*\mathbf{f}_i$, and that $g^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{v}_j\right) \in F_i^+$.

Case 2) is similar to Case 1), except that F_i is propagated down. The matrix $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{B}} \in \{0,1\}^{n_f \times n_v}$ is defined to have entry $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{B}}(i,j) = 1$ if $\mathcal{I}(i,j) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{B}}(i) = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{B}}(i,j) = 0$ otherwise.

We require for Case 3), covered below, as well as for the case of propagation of facets from ridges, to be treated in the next Section, two logical matrices which point to those vertices of S_k that are propagated to vertices of S_{k+1}. The $n_v \times 1$ vector $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PT}}$ is defined by $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PT}}(j) = 1$ if the j^{th} column of $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{T}}$ is not composed entirely of zeros, and $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PT}}(j) = 0$ otherwise. Thus $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PT}}$ points to those vertices which propagate up to a vertex of S_{k+1}. Likewise $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PB}}$ is defined by $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PB}}(j) = 1$ if the j^{th} column of $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{B}}$ is not composed entirely of zeros, and $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PB}}(j) = 0$ otherwise.

Every point of Q is aligned with the origin in the $y_k^* u_k^*$ plane so, in Case 3), by Theorem 6 every $\mathbf{x}_j$ in F_i is propagated to $\mathbf{x}_j^+ = A\mathbf{x}_j + Bu_k \in \partial S_{k+1}$ for all $|u_k| \leq 1$. We show the method for constructing all vertices of the facet F_i^+, and provide a sketch of the proof that it works. Put

$$F_i^+ = \{\mathbf{x}_j^+ : \mathbf{x}_j^+ = A\mathbf{x}_j + Bu_k \text{ where } \mathbf{x}_j \in F_i, u_k \in [-1,1]\}.$$

A convexity argument shows

$$F_i^+ = \{\mathbf{x}_j^+ : \mathbf{x}_j^+ = g^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{v}_j\right) \text{ or } \mathbf{x}_j^+ = g^{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mathbf{v}_j\right), \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathrm{vert}(F_i)\}.$$

We seek the vertices of the facet F_i^+. By Proposition 10, every precursor $\mathbf{v}_j$ of any $\mathbf{v}_j^+$ in the vertex set of F_i^+ is a vertex of F_i. However, it is not necessarily the case that every successor of every vertex of F_i is a vertex of F_i^+. We must remove from F_i^+ those $\mathbf{x}_j^+$ which are not vertices of F_i^+, and this can be done by removing those $\mathbf{x}_j^+$ which are not vertices of S_k.

Define the incidence matrix $\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{T}}(i,j) = 1$ if $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{O}}(i) = 1$, $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PT}}(j) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}(i,j) = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{T}}(i,j) = 0$ otherwise. In words, $\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{T}}(i,j) = 1$ if $\mathbf{v}_j$ propagates up to a vertex of S_k, and $\mathbf{v}_j$ is in F_i, with $(\mathbf{f}_i)_1 = 0$.

The matrix $\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{B}}$, pointing to those vertices of facets with direction vector whose first component is zero that propagate down, is defined similarly. Thus $\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{B}}(i,j) = 1$ if $\mathcal{I}F^{\mathrm{O}}(i) = 1$, $\mathcal{I}V^{\mathrm{PB}}(j) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}(i,j) = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}O^{\mathrm{B}}(i,j) = 0$ otherwise.

This completes the construction of all of Table 1 except the last block.

5.1 Propagation from a ridge in S_k to a facet in S_{k+1}

In the previous Section Case 3) was more intricate than Cases 1) and 2) because it treated facets with directions whose dual lines passed through the origin, opening up an infinite number of alignment possibilities. There is one, and only one, other situation in which a boundary point $\mathbf{x}$ of S_k can have a direction $\mathbf{f}$ in its normal cone which satisfies $\left(\mathbf{f}\right)_1 = 0$. If such $\mathbf{x}$ does not lie on a facet covered by case 3) above, $\mathbf{x}$ must belong to a special type of ridge, to be defined next.

See Fig. 4 where S_k possesses two intersecting facets, with directions $\mathbf{f}_1$ and $\mathbf{f}_2$, whose first components have opposite signs. These facets have the state $\mathbf{x}$ in their intersection, so necessarily there exists a direction in the normal cone of $\mathbf{x}$ whose first component is zero. We define R to be the set of all such ridges of S_k, and denote its cardinality by n_R. Clearly R is non-empty if S_{k-1} is non-empty and full-dimensional.

Definition 12. *Define R to be the set of ridges, R_l, $l = 1, \ldots, n_R$, of S_k with the property that R_l is the intersection of two facets F_1 and F_2 say, for which $(\mathbf{f}_1)_1 < 0$ and $(\mathbf{f}_2)_1 > 0$, where $\mathbf{f}_1$ and $\mathbf{f}_2$ are the directions of F_1 and F_2.*

Associated with any ridge in R there is by definition a direction in the cone generated by $\mathbf{f}_1$ and $\mathbf{f}_2$ having the property that its first component is zero. This direction is unique.

Definition 13. *For any $R_l \in R$ define $\mathbf{f}_l^R$ to be the direction in the convex hull of $\mathbf{f}_1$ and $\mathbf{f}_2$ for which $\left(\mathbf{f}_l^R\right)_1 = 0$.*

Clearly $\mathbf{f}_l^R \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in R_l$. The proof of the following Proposition is omitted.

Proposition 14. *For all $R_l \in R$ there is a facet of S_k with direction $A^*\mathbf{f}_l^R$.*



Figure 4: Two facets intersect in a ridge containing $\mathbf{x}$. The direction $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{N}_{S_k}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies $(\mathbf{x}^*)_1 = 0$.

For any S_k and any $R_l \in R$, the direction $\mathbf{f}_l^R$ can be found using linear interpolation. More precisely $\mathbf{f}_l^R = t\mathbf{f}_1 + (1-t)\mathbf{f}_2$ where $t = (\mathbf{f}_1)_1 / \big((\mathbf{f}_2)_1 - (\mathbf{f}_1)_1\big)$, and $\mathbf{f}_1$ and $\mathbf{f}_2$ are the directions of the facets which intersect to form R_l.

The incidence matrices in the bottom row of Table 1 can now be defined.

The vertex set of R_l is the intersection of the vertex sets of the facets which intersect to form R_l. The matrix $\mathcal{I}RV \in \{0,1\}^{n_R \times n_v}$ has entry $\mathcal{I}RV(l,j) = 1$ if the ridge R_l contains $\mathbf{v}_j$, and $\mathcal{I}RV(l,j) = 0$ otherwise. So the l^{th} row of $\mathcal{I}RV$ points to the vertex set of R_l.

The matrix $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{T}} \in \{0,1\}^{n_R \times n_v}$ has entry $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{T}}(l,j) = 1$ if $\mathcal{I}V^{\text{PT}}(j) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}RV(l,j) = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{T}}(l,j) = 0$ otherwise. So the l^{th} row of $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{T}}$ points to vertices $\mathbf{v}_j$ of R_l which propagate up to vertices of the ridge R_l in S_k.

The matrix $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{B}} \in \{0,1\}^{n_R \times n_v}$ has entry $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{B}}(l,j) = 1$ if $\mathcal{I}V^{\text{PB}}(j) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}RV(l,j) = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{T}}(l,j) = 0$ otherwise. So the l^{th} row of $\mathcal{I}R^{\text{B}}$ points to vertices $\mathbf{v}_j$ of R_l which propagate down to vertices of the ridge R_l in S_k.

This completes the definition of all of the incidence matrices occurring in Table 1. We claim that $\mathcal{I}^+$ constructed according to Table 1 is, after removal of rows and columns containing all zeros, the incidence matrix of S_{k+1}. We have sketched the proof, which ultimately relies on Theorems 6 and 7.

6 Pseudocode

The algorithm takes the facets, vertices and vertex-facet incidence matrix of S_k, and the measurement z_k, as inputs; it outputs the facets, vertices and vertex-facet incidence matrix of S_{k+1}.

Algorithm Updating the uncertainty set

Input: The measurement z_k, the vertex matrix, $\mathbf{V}$, the facet matrix, $\mathbf{F}$, and the vertex-facet incidence matrix, $\mathcal{I}$, of the polytope S_k.

Output: The vertex matrix, $\mathbf{V}^+$, the facet matrix, $\mathbf{F}^+$, and the vertex-facet incidence matrix, $\mathcal{I}^+$, of the polytope S_{k+1}.

1: Sort the vertices in $\mathbf{V}$ and classify the facets in $\mathbf{F}$, as explained in Section 2.4.1
2: $S_k \leftarrow S_k \cap H^{\text{W}+} \cap H^{\text{E}-}$
3: Initialise $\mathcal{I}^+$ equal to the $(3n_f + n_R)$ by $2n_v$ zero matrix
4: Populate the body of Table 1 with the six incidence matrices defined in Section 5
5: $\mathcal{I}^+ \leftarrow \mathcal{I}^+$ with rows and columns composed entirely of zeros removed
6: Construct each column of $\mathbf{F}^+$ by calculating, for each row of $\mathcal{I}^+$, the direction of the propagated facet
7: Construct each column of $\mathbf{V}^+$ by calculating, for each column of $\mathcal{I}^+$, the vertex of S_{k+1} propagated from ∂S_k



Figure 5: Example 1

7 Examples

We give two Examples. The required input for both Examples is given in the code.

7.1 Example 1

The plant is given by $\hat{n} = -7\lambda/6 + \lambda^2/3$ and $\hat{d} = 1 + 8\lambda/35 - 16\lambda^2/35$, and the measurement is $z_k = 1$. Running the code gives the plot shown in Fig. 5. The initial uncertainty set is the triangle shown in the Figure.

7.2 Example 2

The uncertainty set S_k in this Example is taken from Tables 1 and 2 on page 9 of [3]. The vertices are the rows of

$$\mathbf{V}' = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & -2 & 2 & 1 \\ -2 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & -2 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 1 & 2 & -1 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -2 & 2 & -1 \\ -2 & 1 & -2 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

the directions of the facets are the rows of

$$\mathbf{F}' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and the incidence matrix is

$$\mathcal{I} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We illustrate recursive determination of this four dimensional uncertainty set for the fourth order plant given by $\hat{n} = -7\lambda/6 + 3\lambda^2/3 + \lambda^3/2 - 2\lambda^4$ and $\hat{d} = 1 + 8\lambda/35 - 16\lambda^2/35 + 2\lambda^3/5 + 4\lambda^4$.

If the measurements are assumed to be zero at all time instants z_i, $i \geq k$, then after eight iterations it is found that the uncertainty set S_{k+8} is invariant, in the sense that $S_{k+i+1} = S_{k+i}$ for $i \geq 8$. The code proves this because, putting $\mathbf{V} = \text{vert}\big(S_{k+8}\big)$, and $\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ equal to the facet and incidence matrices of S_{k+8}, running the program gives $\mathbf{V}^+ = \mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{F}^+ = \mathbf{F}$ and $\mathcal{I}^+ = \mathcal{I}$, where these equalities are exact (no floating point approximations). It is interesting that $\mathcal{I}$ is 44 by 70, that is the invariant set has 44 facets and 70 vertices. It is the set of initial states for which there exist input and output signals to the plant, $(u_j)_{j=0}^{\infty} = \mathbf{u}$, and $(y_j)_{j=0}^{\infty} = \mathbf{y}$, having the property that $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \leq 1$. In this Example the invariant uncertainty set is a polytope described by rational data.

It is interesting to explore how the complexity of the uncertainty set varies with time. In this example the number of vertices, starting from time k and for successive time instants, is $12, 23, 51, 67, 106, 82, 92, 70, 70, ...$ The complexity stays well within manageable limits. It is to be expected, and this is borne out by running the algorithm for various noise bounds, that increasing the bounds on the measurement noise, while keeping the measurements always at or near zero, will increase the complexity of the uncertainty set. Such mismatch between the measurements and the measurement noise, in the sense that keeping the measurements close to zero excludes many measurements which are consistent with the uncertainty sets being non-empty, is perhaps what is behind the oft quoted assertion that the growing complexity of uncertainty sets makes their use impractical. This issue deserves further investigation.

8 CONCLUSIONS

The algorithm described in this paper, because most calculations use Boolean matrices and are therefore fast, has potential application to any problem requiring set-valued observers. In real-time applications existing exact techniques have limited applicability because at each time instant several linear programs must be solved to remove redundant constraints. Model falsification using set-valued observers, useful for example in fault detection and isolation (see [17] for example), is one area of current research that could perhaps make use of the algorithmic approach presented here. The classical problem of control under uncertainty is another.

References

[1] Vincent Acary, Olivier Bonnefon, and Bernard Brogliato, *Nonsmooth Modeling and Simulation for Switched Circuits, Series: Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, Vol. 69*, Springer, Netherlands, 2011.

[2] T. Alamo, J.M. Bravo, M.J. Redondo, and E.F. Camacho, *A set-membership state estimation algorithm based on {DC} programming*, Automatica, 44 (2008), pp. 216 – 224.

[3] David Avis, David Bremner, and Antoine Deza, eds., *Polyhedral Computation*, vol. 48, CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, USA, 2009.

[4] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and Ian B. Rhodes, *Recursive state estimation for a set-membership description of uncertainty*, IEEE Trans. Automatic Control, AC-16 (1971), pp. 117–128.

[5] Franco Blanchini and Stefano Biani, *Set-Theoretic Methods in Control*, Birkhauser, Boston, 2008.

[6] Franco Blanchini and Mario Sznaier, *A convex optimization approach to synthesizing bounded complexity ℓ^∞ filters*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, 57 (2012), pp. 216–221.

[7] Christophe Combastel, *Zonotopes and kalman observers: Gain optimality under distinct uncertainty paradigms and robust convergence*, Automatica, 55 (2015), pp. 265 – 273.

[8] Eli Fogel and Y.F. Huang, *On the value of information in system identification: Bounded noise case*, Automatica, 18 (1982), pp. 229 – 238.

[9] Robin Hill, Yousong Luo, and Uwe Schwerdtfeger, *Exact recursive updating of uncertainty sets*, arxiv.org/abs/1612.04918v4], Also under review.

[10] S. S. Keerthi and E.G. Gilbert, *Computation of minimum-time feedback control laws for discrete-time systems with state-control constraints*, Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on, 32 (1987), pp. 432–435.

[11] Steven R. Lay, *Convex sets and their applications*, Dover, Mineola, New York, 2007.

[12] M. Milanese and A. Vicino, *Optimal estimation theory for dynamic systems with set membership uncertainty: An overview*, Automatica, 27 (1991), pp. 997 – 1009.

[13] S. H. Mo and J. P. Norton, *Fast and robust algorithm to compute exact polytope parameter bounds*, Math. Comput. Simulation, 32 (1990), pp. 481–493.

[14] Brett Ninness and Graham C. Goodwin, *Estimation of model quality*, Automatica, 31 (1995), pp. 1771 – 1797. Trends in System Identification.

[15] S. V. Rakovic and D. Q. Mayne, *State estimation for piecewise affine, discrete time systems with bounded disturbances*, in Proc. of the 43rd. Conf. on Decision and Control, Bahamas, December 2004, pp. 3557–3562.

[16] Paulo Rosa, Carlos Silvestre, and Michael Athans, *Model falsification using set-valued observers for a class of discrete-time dynamic systems: a coprime factorization approach*, Int. J. Robust. Nonlinear Control, 24 (2014), pp. 2928–2942.

[17] Paulo Rosa, Carlos Silvestre, Jeff S. Shamma, and Michael Athans, *Fault detection and isolation of ltv systems using set-valued observers*, in Proc. of the 49th. Conf. on Decision and Control, Atlanta, December 2010, pp. 768–773.

[18] F.C. Schweppe, *Recursive state estimation: Unknown but bounded errors and system inputs*, Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on, 13 (1968), pp. 22–28.

[19] Joseph K. Scott, Davide M. Raimondo, Giuseppe Roberto Marseglia, and Richard D. Braatz, *Constrained zonotopes: A new tool for set-based estimation and fault detection*, Automatica, 69 (2016), pp. 126 – 136.

[20] J.S. Shamma and Kuang-Yang Tu, *Set-valued observers and optimal disturbance rejection*, Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on, 44 (1999), pp. 253–264.

[21] A.A. Stoorvogel, l_1 *state estimation for linear systems using nonlinear observers*, in Decision and Control, 1996., Proceedings of the 35th IEEE Conference on, vol. 3, 1996, pp. 2407–2411 vol.3.

[22] Roberto Tempo, *Robust estimation and filtering in the presence of bounded noise*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, 33 (1988), pp. 864–867.

[23] H. S. Witsenhausen, *Sets of possible states of linear systems given perturbed observations.*, IEEE Trans. Automatic Control, AC-13 (1968), pp. 556–558.

[24] Gunter M. Ziegler, *Lectures on Polytopes*, Springer, New York, 1995.